

SOME SEASONABLE
REMARKS

Upon a PAMPHLET, entitled,

REASONS

Alledged against

Dr. *RUNDLE*'s Promotion

TO THE

SEE of *GLOUCESTER*.

The Author not being in *London* to inspect these
Remarks himself, the Reader is desired to
correct the following Errata:

PAge 2. line 9. for impudent, read imprudent. l. 22.
for paeg, r. page. P. 3. l. 8. for discourage, r. dis-
couraged. P. 5. for as, r. has. P. 14. l. 2. for is, r. in
this Case. l. 4. add, Therefore in my humble Opinion.

SOME SEASONABLE
REMARKS

Upon a PAMPHLET entitled the

REASONS

Alledged against

Dr. RUNDLE's Promotion

TO THE

SEE of GLOUCESTER,

Seriously and Dispassionately consider'd,

B E I N G

A full Detection of the gross Absurdities, scandalous Invectives, fulsom Panegyries, and unjust Misrepresentations of the AUTHOR of that PAMPHLET.

To which is annexed, by way of SUPPLEMENT,

A Short ANSWER

TO THE

REASONS Alleged, &c.

Published in the WEEKLY MISCELLANY on
Saturday, December, 7. 1734.

The Second EDITION.

L O N D O N:

Printed for A. DODD, without Temple-Bar;
 E. NUTT, and E. COOKE, at the Royal-Exchange;
 and the Booksellers of London and Westminster. 1735. Price 6d.



2

1880



S O M E
Seasonable REMARKS
Upon the
REASONS, &c.



WAS Reading the other Day a Pamphlet called, *The Reasons alledged against DR. RUNDLE'S Promotion to the See of G—— Seriously and Dispassionately Considered*; and found they contained several Things proper to be taken Notice of: I therefore sat down and made the following Remarks upon it.

First, of all, The Author begins his Letter with reflecting on the Principles of a *Certain Great Churchman*, who he says has long been intrusted with the chief Direction of Ecclesiastical Affairs in this Kingdom: And seems
B very

very much disturbed at his being consulted and advised with about the fitness of Persons for spiritual Preferments. He endeavours (tho' but weakly) to vilify the Character of this great Man, and thereupon quotes a Passage out of the Preface of *Gibson's Codex Juris*, &c.

But this famous Author should first have consulted with himself, whether he would not have thought it impudent and inconsistent; nay, I may say presumptuous, for any of the Clergy, when a Place should become vacant in the Law, to concern themselves any farther in those Matters than is just requisite for them, much less to insist upon the KING's Promise for such a Person to be preferr'd, whom they recommended, and upon Refusal that they would resent it.

Had he kept to his *Title*, and SERIOUSLY and DISPASSIONATELY CONSIDERED the Nature of these Things, he could not with any Honour or Conscience insist upon them.

In page 5 he says, The first Objection urged against Dr. R——, was, that he was an Enemy to our Constitution.

And endeavours to shew that all those under that Denomination, are Friends to Liberty. I must confess, if that is the meaning of those Words, it is what I never heard of before; Nor I believe no Man besides. Perhaps it may be a new Law imposed upon the unthinking World, by the great Men of that Profession.

If

If so, — Those who are at this Time kept upon their Recognizances, every first and last Day of Term, for publishing Libels against the *present Government*, one of whom is a Clergyman; may insist upon the same Privilege, that they were Friends to Liberty, that they only promoted Attempts for its Service, and Discourage what might abridge it : That they were otherwise Persons of universal Benevolence, and so on.

But supposing, continues he, that *He* is an Enemy to our Constitution ; What Evidence can be given, or ought to be required to clear any one of this Imputation.

I answer, that were he as in p. 18 he is described to be. — A Man of Ingenuity, easy in Conversation, a Man of no Guile, a Lover of Truth, of Hospitality, a Man of good natural Parts, and of good acquired ones too. Surely a Man with these great Advantages, as he calls them, would not scruple to shew himself in Print, in Defence of his own good Character, especially when he is greatly called upon so to do. By his Silence the World must suppose two Things; either that he is guilty of those Facts laid to his Charge, or to judge more favourably of him, that he is a Man of little or no Ingenuity, or Conversation, and one of very low, if any natural Parts. This is the likeliest Construction one can put upon the whole Matter;

and I think there is sufficient Grounds for such a Belief, especially to those who are perfect Strangers to him.

The second Objection, he says, was, that Dr. R. — was suspected of Heresy. — He gives a long Detail of the Heinousness of the Crime, and alledges that in the present Case no Heresy was specify'd, but only a Suspicion of it, and the Grounds of that Suspicion kept secret, purely as a Bar to his Promotion.

Now I need not go any farther to prove the Truth of this Fact, (which altho' done many Years ago, yet cannot be denied by any of his Friends) than to refer it to that worthy Clergyman who is ready to demonstrate it to any one, that is not already byass'd by private Views or Interests, or carried away with Malice, or Party Prejudice.

The Author proceeds with excusing the Dr. from defending himself in Print, by asking who is to sit as Judge in this Case? or who is to be his Inquisitor?

It may easily be answered, that in point of Honour, Duty, and Interest, he should publickly defend his own Cause, and then leave it to the impartial World to judge, whether those Accusations against him are actually true or not; and if he fairly acquits himself of them all, and proves that they were unjustly laid upon him, he will be declared innocent, and only blamed for not opening the whole Affair before.

Otherwise

Oth
public
is the
been

An
Fact.
dropt
that
thing
rather
ons v

Th
Drs.
Spiri
I wo
ty of
own
Impa
take
Spiri
the
the
the
thei
Lea
verf
eith
dire
on
men

Otherwise — if he refuses to defend himself publicly, it will still appear to the World he is the Aggressor, and that all which he has been charged with is but too true.

And more especially so, if what I am told is Fact. — That the Dr. desists from, and has dropt his Pretensions to the Bishoprick, and that he desires not to be preferr'd. All these things make it appear still worse, and serve rather to aggravate than mitigate the Imputations wherewith he is Charged.

The Author as all along insisted upon the Drs. being a Friend to Liberty, to public Spirit, and to the Right of private Judgment. I would be glad to be informed, if the Liberty of the Press, the Liberty of Defending his own Cause, the Liberty of Appealing to the Impartial World, is not what he means. I take those to be Men of Liberty, and public Spirit, who open their own Causes plainly to the World, and give themselves up intirely to the Censure of it; and those to be Friends to the Right of Private Judgment, who Refer their Disputes to the Private Judgment of the Learned World. And Consequently the Reverse to be Men, as the Author calls them, either cool or false Friends to Liberty, or else direct Enemies to it. Those are in my Opinion *Imprudent*, and not *proper Men* to be recommended to Favour.

The

The Author goes on in his usual Strain, and pretends to persuade the World that Dr. R— is accused he knows not of what, nor who are his Accusers: But that has been already argued and sufficiently proved, and only tends, to shew what poor mean Arts the Author when at his last Shifts can be guilty of, rather than not acquit his Client of those Facts laid to his Charge. He likewise asks in what Manner the Dr. must acquit himself; when he cannot at the same Time be ignorant, nor deny, that the Dr. has several Times been importuned by his Friends to undertake his own Defence, and has as often refused it.

What Man can then take upon himself to defend the Cause of another Person, when that Person as good as owns himself Guilty, by not complying with the Importunities and Intreaties of his Friends, in discharging himself of his Crimes.

He then goes on in p. 15, in aspersing the Characters of the whole Bench of Bishops, in rendring them Tools of the Administration, and affirms that last Winter when the Dr. was Ill; a certain great Churchman should advise His Majesty to fill up the Vacancies before the *Parliament* sat, upon Account of several Affairs of great Importance lying upon the Carpet; when it was supposed the opposite Party would be very strong against the Court; and that it would be necessary for even one single Vote,

to

to turn the Scale, and probably save the Administration.

A likely Matter indeed!

I would appeal to any reasonable Man for the Truth of these Assertions. Whether they are not all Chimera's, Fantasies, and such like? Or rather degrading, scandalous Impositions thrown on this *great* and *good Man* on purpose to asperse and vilify his Character were they able? But all who know him will easily judge from whence this premeditated Malice came, and with what servile Arts they endeavour to asperse him.

I might carry this Point very far, and make it a great Part of the Subject of my Discourse in setting forth the Abilities of this Great Man; but shall at present beg leave to desist, and just give one Hint of the Fable of the Proud Frog. That little Animal striving to equal the Bulk of the Ox, burst herself in sunder with Envy.

When I first thought of this Fable, I imagined how well it might be adapted to this present Discourse, and I cannot but conceive, that those who unjustly rail against this *great Man* are like the insignificant Frog; as he is undoubtedly so much superior in Quality.

In the next Place he asks, Upon what Law, or upon what Practice, or upon what Reason all this is founded, that no Man is to recommend to a *Bishoprick*, unless the Recommendation be made by some or all the *Bishops*.

It

It is for certain founded upon the Law of Nature and Reason, that Bishops ought to recommend to *Bishopricks*. That every Tide ought to run in its own proper Channel. That the *Law* is independent of the *Church*, and the *Church* should be independent of the *Law*. That a *Layman* had no Right to interfere with a *Clergyman*, nor a *Clergyman* with a *Layman*. That *Spiritual* Matters should have no Concern with *Temporal* Matters, nor *Temporal* Matters with *Spiritual* Matters.

If otherwise ----- what need is there for any such Difference as there is, and ought to be, between the two Courts? Nay, not only so--- but it would be entirely subverting *Church* Government, an infinite Detriment to the *Nation* in general, and to *Religion* in particular. A *Divine* then must be obliged to stand the Test of every sorry illiterate Fellow, who should take it in his Head to call *him* to an Account, or charge *him* perhaps with that which *he* never had any Concern with.

He says likewise, that if the Crown may not nominate any Man to a *Bishoprick*, except him that one particular Person approves, it is not the Crown that has the Power of making *Bishops*----- but he that has the Negative upon the Crown. I may also add the same Reflection relating to the *Law*.

But when the Objections against a Man are made publick, the World becomes Judges. I agree

agree with him so far, that would he *himself* answer all the Objections alledged against him, and appeal to the reasonable World, the World would then become Judges, and many People would be Advocates for his Cause.----- But if he refuses to open the Merits of his own Cause, how then can any Person be a proper Judge to the contrary, but that the Contents alledged against him are but too true ?

But it seems none of the Objections against Dr. R. imply want of Learning, want of good Temper, defect in Morals, &c. If they don't, 'tis high time he should now begin to shew his Learning, and his Morals, and his Doctrine ; and if we may judge by those who are hearty Advocates in the Cause, he must rather be an Enemy than a Friend to those who are not of the same Sentiments with himself. He affirms, that as there is one *Bishop* for the Doctor, that is enough to save his Point : But he is not insensible that Kissing goes by Favour, and that many a deserving Man, for want of Friends to out-number his Adversary, has lost his Point, altho' perhaps the other might not be half so deserving.---- He proceeds to contradict himself by first insisting upon only one *Bishop*, and presently after says, that many *Bishops* wonder at, and openly declare against these Proceedings, which is known to be an intolerable Untruth. The next Scene is opened, and discovers those scandalous Names of Informer, Spy, and what

not, thrown upon that worthy Gentleman who bore test of Dr. R— Conversation. Are these proper Names to brand a *Clergyman* with? Are they not rather Marks of Infamy, fit for the vilest of Men? and can that *great Man*, who is the Son of a *Clergyman*, bear the sacred *Cloth* to be so much abused, despised, and trampled upon? I doubt not but the *great Churchman* himself (if the Author durst take those Liberties without being called to account for so doing) would likewise share in his Incendiaries, and have those lasting Marks of Infamy thrown upon him. This plainly shows, what Friends they are to those who are not of the same Opinion with themselves. But would any Man judge the whole Reputation of a Man from an unguarded Expression, No--- and yet a Man must stand or fall by his Words and Actions, otherwise how would you judge him. Dr. R. absolutely denies that he ever said what he is charged with, because if he owned it, it would be inconsistent with his Interest, and consequently a Bar to his Promotion.----- *Ergo* 'tis better to deny it. But for a Clergyman to urge Facts against a Clergyman--- Why not if those Facts be true, and the Clergyman be guilty of them. There ought to be no Respect of Persons. Was a great Divine to commit High-treason, and a reputed Clergyman to be Witness against him----- I make no doubt but he would stand as liable to be impeached

peached as a private Gentleman, according to the Laws of the Land. He then enters upon an Objection, that no Regard was to be paid to what was done *ex Officio*, and applies the B----P of L----N's Charges to the same Purpose. But whoever urged those Things; I am confident no *Bishop* did, and that its either some of the Author's Productions, or the Surmises of some of his Friends. Certainly such a good Man as Dr. R. is represented to be, never appeared in the World before. He is a Man of no Vices, no Immoralities, nor no Infidelities. I never knew but what all Men, of what Rank, Degrees, or Denominations soever, had some favourite Vice or other, some darling Sin to cope with---- but he has none. Very pleasant truly. Such an ENOCH is much fitter to be translated to Heaven than the *Bishoprick of Gloucester*. Could the Author prove his Words, I should agree with him that 'tis hardly conceivable, that so violent a Spirit, should be stirr'd up against an innocent inoffensive, good-natur'd Man, against whom no Vices can be justly objected.--- And that it was for his Goodness he was envy'd, by Reason he so much the more outshone the Rest of Mankind. He is a Man that will admit of no Parallel!

*He is a Man—take him for all in all,
I ne'er shall look upon his like again.*

Its next said, that all the Bishops will resent

it, that they threaten to subvert the Government if a Man is preferred *obnoxious* to them. — And that it is now become the L—C—R's Cause rather than Dr. R—. As to the first Objection, I leave it to the impartial World to judge the Truth and Likelihood of it, whether it at all agrees with that known Condescension with which the Church of late Years have behaved to the Crown. And to the last, if I have been right informed, and probably it may be true, it is said by R— Friends, that if the great Man has not Interest enough to carry his Point, it will go a great Way towards inducing him to lay down, nay, that HE threatens so to do. If so — who then has the Negative upon the Crown. This is going a Step further than only mere Resentment. What Bishop has ever taken upon himself that grand Prerogative? This certainly is most likely to subvert the Government. Or who has ever taken upon himself to reflect upon the Person of the L—DC—R, or to cabal against him, as this Author is suffered to do against the *Clergy*? He affirms that every Particular against the Dr. is given up, which is a known Falstiy. Every Point has been as strongly proved, as the Nature of the Cause will admit. The next Thing is — the Doctor is not desirous of Gain; that Money is what he always despised. If so, he is a Man of a very singular Merit. I hardly ever knew any *Lawyer* or *Divine* but what were desirous
after

after that precious Metal; and cannot help saying, that he who is not to be equall'd in Person, ought not to be equall'd in Quality. The next Thing propos'd was a Bishoprick in *Ireland*, which would soon become vacant thro' the Infirmary of the present Bishop; but as the Author cannot insist upon the Person who propos'd it, it is of little or no Signification. Perhaps after all has been argued, and intirely given up by them, it may still be objected, that as his *Majesty* has promised Dr. R. the Bishoprick, it would be a Diminution of his Power to dissent from his *Royal Word*, and upon that Account they will insist upon it.

But in Answer to that, I would intimate to them, that as his *Majesty's Royal Word* was as good as extorted from him, by a *Great Man* insisting upon it before the KING was thoroughly acquainted with, or had enquired into his Character; the Promise upon that Account becomes void, and of none Effect, if his *Majesty* should be pleased to declare it so. And it could be of no ill Consequence, by Reason it has already been a Precedent practis'd many Years ago, in the Reign of as Great and Good a Queen as ever sat upon the *British* Throne; not as an excellent Handle to oppress an innocent Man with, as they might represent it, but as a Precedent to be called in Question
whenever

whenever the *King's Royal Word* should be drawn from him inadvertently, as is this Case.

Therefore it would be better for his Majesty to desist from his Promise at present, rather than by keeping it give liberty to any one to rely upon such Precedents hereafter.

Lastly, to sum up this great Dispute—After what has been argued, and after all the Advice which the Crown has received upon this Subject, it must be left to the sole Determination of his *Majesty*; and as according to the Laws of the Land, the *King can do no wrong*; if any wrong Step is taken in this Affair, it must certainly be owing to the frequent Importunities and Advices of those about him. But *His Majesty* has many times declared, that he would walk in the Steps of the *glorious Queen Anne*; that he would Defend the Rights and Privileges of the Church of *England* as by Law Established; and that he would suffer no Man to infringe or break in upon them. To conclude, as this is a very intricate Point, our *King* may be justly compared to the Wise *King Solomon*, who after mature Deliberation discovered the right Mother of the Child by the Affection she bore it.

P. S. Since this Letter was finished, I have been informed, that the Author of those Reasons against Dr. R. was the Revd. Mr. W—s,
and

and that he is to enjoy a good Living as a Reward for his Trouble : If so, he has not followed his Patron's Examples. And sorry I am that any Divine should lessen himself so much, and be so greedy of filthy Lucre, as to sacrifice the Rights of his own Church, purely to *raise* himself to *Promotion*.



A LETTER published in the
Weekly Miscellany, Saturday,
December, 7th. 1734.

To RICHARD HOOKER, Esq;

S I R,

THERE has been a Pamphlet lately published, entitled, *The Reasons alledged against Dr. Rundle's Promotion to the See of G—*—, seriously and dispassionately considered; which, I think, deserves Notice. Till somebody is at Leisure to do full Justice to the Author, I hope the following Sketch will not be unacceptable to the Publick; which therefore I desire may be allowed a Place in your *Miscellany*.

1. The Author seems to me throughout to impute it as a *Crime* to any Ecclesiastick, *great* or *small*, that he endeavours to *preserve* the Constitution of the Church, of which he is a Member, and is desirous that the Government of it may be committed, not to
Persons

ely
al-
the
ely
ce.
ice
tch
k;
a
to
eat
the
he
Go-
to
ons

to
eat
the
he
Go-
to
ons

D

prosecuted upon *Suspicion* only, in order to be *punished* for his *Opinions*; when no more is meant, than that one, who is a Candidate for *Favour*, should first remove all reasonable *Objections* which are raised against his being *duly qualified* for it; particularly, that one who sues to be a *Governor* in the Church, should wipe of all *Suspensions* of his being *disaffected* to it.

4. He suggests that Dr. R—— and his Friends *do not know* what are the *Imputations* from which he should clear himself. I do not take upon myself to be his *Accuser*: But did Dr. R—— or his Friends never hear that he had been charged with *Arianism*, and a *Denial* of a *Fact*, which is expressly affirmed by *Moses* in the *Old Testament*, and by *St. Paul* and *St. James* in the *New*?

5. He suggests, that whereas some of Dr. R——'s Friends appealed to his *Charges* made at his *Archi-diaconal Visitations*, in Evidence for his hearty Attachments to the Truth of the Gospel, it was said in Answer, that *no* Regard was to be paid to what was done *ex Officio*. No-body has ever said that a *Visitation Charge* is *therefore* to be disregarded, *because* it is delivered *ex Officio*: But it has been said, very properly, that Dr. R—— would have *published* those *Charges* made so long before he had any Views to a *Bishoprick*, if he had known that they contained such Things as would have set him right in the Opinion of the
World.

World. Unless he thinks, with this Writer, that any Step of that kind, towards the vindicating himself on this Occasion, would be a *tame Submission* to an *Usurpation*.

6. He affirms, that Dr. R—— avers, that he had never any such Notions *in his Head or Heart* as he is charged with. But this doth not yet appear.

7. In his Treatment of the two Clergymen, who (as it is said) can, and will, if Occasion requires, bear Testimony against Dr. R—— this Writer has shewn no sort of Regard to *Truth or Decency*. One is represented as a *poor Creature*, unqualified to judge of the most common Incidents in Conversation, ready to be offended and *choaked* at *even demonstrable Truths*; the other as a *Tale-bearer, Pickthank, Informer*, and I know not what. I am willing to rest these Matters upon the Judgment of the Publick; but there is one Thing that I cannot help observing, *viz.* That what gives this Writer the greatest Offence in the Characters of these Gentlemen, is their *Zeal and Piety*, which seem to appear, in his Eyes, a much *worse Crime* than *want of Faith*. It may be questioned, indeed, whether he will allow *Faith* a Place among the Christian Virtues; for in that large Catalogue of Dr. R——'s Virtues, given by this Writer, I find not one single Word about Dr. R——'s ORTHODOXY, for which (it should seem)

this Writer *dares not vouch*, tho' he knows this is the single Point in Question.

8. This *Gentleman of the Temple* expressly asserts, that the Laws of the Land have *not* any where *defined* what is *Heresy*. But he knows, or ought to have known, 1. That 1. *Eliz. C. 1.* THAT is *Heresy*, which has been adjudged to be such by the first four general Councils, and that the first of those four is the Council of Nice, which condemned *Arius* and his Adherents. 2. That in a much later Statute *viz. 9, 10, Will. III. Cap. 32.* among the *blasphemous* and *impious Opinions*, contrary to the Doctrine and Principles of the Christian Religion, (they are the *Words* of that Statute) there are two. The denying any of the Persons in the Holy Trinity to be GOD, and the denying the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be of divine Authority. When he has consulted his Statute-Book, and considered what the Objections to this Promotion are, he may possibly call in his Flourishes upon this Head, and think more favourably of the Opposition that has been made to it; especially if he will consider that the Statute of *Hen. VIII.* to which he refers, relates to *criminal* Prosecutions upon *Suspicion*; not to the *clearing* a Man's *Character*, in order to obtain a *Favour*, or a Place of *Authority* in the Church.

9. This

9. This *Gentleman of the Temple*, who pretends with great Authority to deal out the Laws of the Land, hath likewise misrepresented the Statute, 25 *Hen. VIII.* and when he looks upon his Statute Book, he will see that when the Letters Patents are directed to an Archbishop to confirm and consecrate a Bishop, there is nothing in that Statute which affects the *Suffragans* of such Archbishop. Their Concern within that Statute, is, upon the Vacancy of an Archbishoprick, in Case the Letters Patents be directed to them.

10. He intimates, that the Opposers of Dr. R——'s Promotion are of Opinion, and do insist, that *no* Man *ought* to be preferred to a Bishoprick, unless the Recommendation is made by *some*, or *all* the Bishops; and, in particular, that *Lawyers* ought not to intermiddle in such Affairs. Which is absolutely false. No body ever pretended to exclude Lawyers, or any other Lay Person, from commending to Bishopricks, provided the Person recommended has a clear Character; of which the late Promotion to the Bishoprick of *Carlisle* is an Instance. Yet in the general no one ought to be so hardy as to affirm, that *Bishops* ordinarily are not better Judges than Lawyers, of the Characters and Qualifications of Persons proper to be recommended by Bishopricks.

11. He

11. He suggests, with great Assurance, that not only *one*, but *many* of the Bishops, are for Dr. R—'s Promotion. But to give that Suggestion its proper Weight, it ought to have been made appear, that *more* than *one* are for it, and will not only be ready to *join* in the *consecrating* him, when nominated; but also in *recommending* him, which is what this Writer roundly asserts.

12. He suggests as if something had been *given up* which was *at first* objected to Dr. R—'s Promotion. It is false. *Nothing* has been *given up*, which was *at first* objected.

13. He suggests I know not what *Projects* of making Dr. R— Dean of *Durham*, or giving him some Bishoprick in *Ireland*. Meer Town-talk! which he dares *not* PRETEND to *say from whence* or *from whom* it came; and yet, in about ten Lines after, has the Impudence to *pin* it upon the *great Ecclesiastick*, (as he thinks fit to call the *Bishop* of *L—n*) and argue upon it as if HE was responsible in this Case.

14. He suggests, that *all* the Clergy, who are against Dr. R—'s Promotion (*i. e.* the *whole Body* of the Clergy, with very few Exceptions) are *Enemies* to *Liberty*, and to the present *Royal Family*; which is a vile Slander. But it is Truth, and no Slander, that there is not an *Infidel*, *Deist*, or *modern Freethinker* in the

the K
motio
Th
Publi
the P
serva
little
had
Book
ampl
this
be t
of n
Inve

the Kingdom, who is not zealous *for* his Promotion.

This, Sir, is what I have to offer to the Publick at present. I have not marked down the Pages which will justify the particular Observations, because I thought it would be of little Use to many who read your Paper. I had rather that every Body would read the Book itself, from which they will receive ample Conviction, and see that this *serious*, this *dispassionate*, and (as no doubt he would be thought) *fair* and *judicious* Writer, is full of nothing else but the *strongest Partiality*, *Invective*, *Panegyrick*, and *Misrepresentation*.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

F I N I S.

Lately Published,

The Second EDITION of,

A Proper Reply to the Author of a Letter to the Reverend Dr. CODEX, upon the Subject of his Modest Instruction to the Crown: Wherein that Reverend Doctor is fully Vindicated from those base Aspersions thrown upon him, and the whole Answered Paragraph by Paragraph, in a Letter to a most Reverend Lawyer.

Deter Dignissimo.

Sold by the Booksellers of London
and Westminster. Price 6 d.



et-
X,
ion
nd
ose
nd
Pa-
nd

don